

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-14 and 19-28 were rejected. By the present Response, claims 1, 11, 14, 23 and 24 are amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-5, 8-14, 19-28 will remain pending in the present patent application. All of the pending claims are believed to be clearly allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the amendments.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 14, 23 and 24 were objected to because of certain informalities. By the present response, claims 1, 14, 23 and 24 have been amended to address the Examiner's objections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11, 14 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of antecedent basis for certain limitations in the claims. Claims 1 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that it is not known wherein the system the calculation of the time difference of arrival takes place.

By the present response, claims 11, 14 and 24 have been amended to provide the antecedent basis for the limitations pointed out by the Examiner. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 1 and 23 as well as the specification clearly states that the calculation of the time difference of arrival takes place at each of the at least three receivers. In particular, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, calculating, at each of the at least three receivers, a plurality of time differences of arrival data. Similarly, claim 23 recites, *inter alia*, determining a location of at least one of the objects within said area of interest based on *time difference of arrival information calculated at each of the at least three*

receivers. (Emphasis added). Support for claims 1 and 23 can be found in paragraph [0096] that describes where the difference in arrival time is calculated. The second last line of paragraph [0096] states, “The fixed transmitters send message packets at regular time intervals, and the difference in arrival time between the fixed transmitter packet and the mobile tag transmitter packet is measured in each receiver using the receiver’s local clock.” Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the §112 rejection of claims 1 and 23.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick K. Patnode/

Patrick K. Patnode

Reg. No. 40,121

General Electric Company

Building K1, Room 3A54A

Niskayuna, New York 12309

(518) 387-5286

September 18, 2008